PATENT

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in a telephone conference dated January 4, 2004. It was agreed that Applicants would like to respond to the Office Action, but are prevented from doing so because the Action is inconsistent. It was also agreed that Applicants should request clarification of the rejections. Pursuant to the Examiner's instructions, Applicants ask for a revised Office Action as follows.

## According to the paragraph preambles:

- ¶3. Claims 15-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Todd et al.
- ¶5. Claims 1-12, 14, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly obvious over Todd et al.

## According to the paragraph text, however:

- ¶3. In addition to claims 15-25, and 27, claims 1-3, 12, and 14 are also addressed under this §102 rejection (see page 3, line 3 of the Office Action).
- ¶5. Claims 1-12 and 14 are not addressed under this §103 rejection, although claim 28 is addressed.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request clarification of the rejections of the Office Action so that the paragraph preambles conform with the paragraph text.

Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/658,074
Response dated January 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan S. Cassell Reg. No. 42,396

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 650-326-2400 / Fax: 415-576-0300 NSC:nap 60387823 v1 PAGE 6/6 \* RCVD AT 1/31/2005 7:41:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 \* DNIS:8729306 \* CSID:16503262422 \* DURATION (mm-ss):01-22

75